.

**From:** Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
**Sent:** Friday, January 27, 2012 8:08 AM
**To:** Piro, Peter (DPH); Salemi, Charles (DPH)
**Subject:** RE: Fentanyl Samples

Sounds good

---

**From:** Piro, Peter (DPH)
**Sent:** Friday, January 27, 2012 7:15 AM
**To:** Salemi, Charles (DPH); Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
**Subject:** RE: Fentanyl Samples

What I plan to do is first screen the 50:50 (150 uL sample: 150 uL methanol) so we don't potentially lose anything during the evaporation step. To test the 50:50 I can set up the method to only consume 3 uL. Then I would evaporate the sample and bring the final volume back to 150 uL or 148.5 uL if you think I need to be that technical. Fentanyls volatility in 100% methanol will make confirmation much easier and no dilution factors will be involved, making a direct comparison to the standard easier. Ultimately, I have three objectives for the GC/MS portion of this analysis.
1. Was anything extraneous added to the sample?
2. Confirming the active ingredient to validate the LC results.
3. To give a presumptive opinion of whether or not the sample was diluted

Any changes to the sample prep will obviously be noted on my powder sheet.

---

**From:** Salemi, Charles (DPH)
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2012 11:48 AM
**To:** Nassif, Julianne (DPH); Piro, Peter (DPH)
**Subject:** RE: Fentanyl Samples

Fine, If its similar to the first batch and doesn't skew the results, it's fine with me. CBS

---

**From:** Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2012 11:22 AM
**To:** Piro, Peter (DPH)
**Cc:** Salemi, Charles (DPH)
**Subject:** RE: Fentanyl Samples

Seems OK to me. Chuck?

---

**From:** Piro, Peter (DPH)
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2012 11:15 AM
**To:** Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
**Cc:** Salemi, Charles (DPH)
**Subject:** RE: Fentanyl Samples

Peter,
Couple of questions

1) what did you do last time? 50/50 for screening and confirmation

2) Were there problems? Mostly sensitivity, the jury is still out on the long term effect of water on our columns
3) What are the advantages of this approach? Greater sensitivity when confirming the primary ingredient, especially fentanyl since the control starts out at 0.05 mg/ml. Also, we can use a normal stune without altering existing methods.
4) How will this impact the turnaround Not at all and this may not be necessary for midazolam and lorazepam. Tampered morphine and fentanyl were the hard ones to confirm.

Thanks, Julie

Peter Piro
GC/MS Laboratory Supervisor I
Department of Public Health
Hinton State Laboratory Institute
Forensic Drug Laboratory, Rm 361
305 South Street
Jamaica Plain, Ma 02130
617-983-6634
Peter.Piro@state.ma.us

---

**From:** Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2012 10:13 AM
**To:** Piro, Peter (DPH)
**Cc:** Salemi, Charles (DPH)
**Subject:** RE: Fentanyl Samples

Peter,
Couple of questions

5) what did you do last time?
6) Were there problems?
7) What are the advantages of this approach?
8) How will this impact the turnaround

Thanks, Julie

---

**From:** Piro, Peter (DPH)
**Sent:** Thursday, January 26, 2012 7:22 AM
**To:** Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
**Cc:** Salemi, Charles (DPH)
**Subject:** Fentanyl Samples

Julie/Chuck
For the EMT fentanyl samples that I'm working on, does anyone have any objections if I first screen the samples 50:50 (sample:methanol) and then evaporate the 50:50 so it can be re-dissolved in methanol for confirmation of the primary constituent?

Peter Piro
GC/MS Laboratory Supervisor I
Department of Public Health
Hinton State Laboratory Institute
Forensic Drug Laboratory, Rm 361
305 South Street
Jamaica Plain, Ma 02130
617-983-6634
Peter.Piro@state.ma.us